

## Meeting Notes

### Assess Transmission Future Needs SDT — Project 2006-02

**November 17–19, 2008**

Ameren Offices  
St. Louis, MO

#### 1. Administrative Items

a. Introductions and Quorum

The Vice Chair called the meeting to order at 1:30 p.m. CST on Monday, November 17, 2008 at the Ameren offices in St. Louis, MO. Meeting participants were:

Bill Harm	Doug Hohlbaugh	Julius Horvath
Bob Jones	Brian Keel	Ron Mazur
Bob Millard, Vice Chair	Bernie Pasternack	Bob Pierce
Chifong Thomas	Dana Walters	Ray Kershaw, Observer
Charles Long, Observer	Steve Rueckert, Observer	Curt Stepanek, Observer
Ed Dobrowolski, NERC		

b. NERC Antitrust Compliance Guidelines — Ed Dobrowolski

There were no questions raised on the NERC Antitrust Compliance Guidelines.

c. Agenda and Objectives — Bob Millard

The objective of this meeting was to resolve the issues required to finalize the comment responses.

#### 2. Review Protection Sub-team Proposal to Add Requirements — Brian Keel

The basis for the discussion was the Power Point presentation distributed by Brian prior to the meeting.

The sub-team proposal is that the new R3.2 covers the old R1.3.10 and the new R1.1 covers the old R1.3.12. In addition, the SDT does not believe that there would be a planned or maintenance outage of Protection Systems or their components, of any duration, scheduled more than a year in advance and thus within the Planning Horizon.

The wording of P5 was changed to provide clarity. The SDT is not going to attempt to raise the bar here as the SPCTF is going to address this issue. However, the SDT will keep the higher performance requirements for above 300 kV.

New Requirements R3.2.3 (steady state) and R5.4 (stability) were added to address control devices.

As part of the review of this issue, the SDT made minor grammatical changes to R1.1, R1.1.2, R1.1.4, and R1.1.6.

### **3. Discuss WECC Common Right-of-Way Approach**

When the WECC representatives presented the definitions, they indicated that exemptions could be granted on a case by case basis. It was also noted that other regions have similar distance specifications. The SDT believes that this item is not appropriate for a national standard and is better left to the regions as a criterion or a variance as appropriate.

### **4. Review Proposed Change to R2.5 — Bob Jones**

This requirement has been deleted and therefore is no longer an issue.

### **5. Finalize Responses to Comments**

a. Team B — Q3, 7, 8, and 11: Chifong Thomas

1) General

Q3 — The following definitions were changed in the roadmap: Consequential Load Loss and Non-Consequential Load Loss. New definitions were supplied for: Load Reduction and Supplemental Load Loss. Requirement R3.3.2.1 was changed. The SDT also re-iterated the position that no load can be lost on a first contingency.

Q8 — The definition of a bus-tie breaker was changed.

2) Q7: Single table — Doug Hohlbaugh

The SDT is not going to move to a single table. The comments to the first posting clearly indicated that the industry is okay with the two table approach. However, there were many comments on the format of the current tables. Doug will work on resolving the format issues and present a proposed solution to the SDT in Charlotte.

**Action Item** — Doug will present a cleaned up version of the tables to the SDT in Charlotte.

3) Q11 Sub-team report — Charles Long

The SDT agreed with the general approach suggested by the sub-team. P1 will remain as a 'No' with no footnote but P3, P4 for > 300 kV, and P5 for > 300 kV will say 'No' with a reference to new footnote 6.

- b. Team C — Q15: Darrin Church
  - 1) Spare equipment revision — new R3.3.4 based on paragraphs 1724 and 1725 of Order 693.

A new R2.1.5 was developed to accommodate the spare equipment strategy. In addition, R2.1.3.3 was revised.

- c. Team D — Q10: Bob Millard
  - 1) Review wording to roadmap based on Q1 changes suggested by Team A.

Changes were made to R2.1.3 and the associated sub-requirements, R2.4.3 and the associated sub-requirements, and R2.7.

Requirements R2.1.4, R2.4.4, and R2.7.4 were deleted.

The SDT decided not to insert benchmarks as they viewed them as too prescriptive on one hand whereas others may view them as the ceiling consideration for developing a Corrective Action Plan.

## **6. Review Proposed VSL — Doug Hohlbaugh, Bob Millard, Tom Gentile**

This item was not discussed due to time constraints.

## **7. Review Implementation Plan — Bernie Pasternack**

The SDT considers this standard as a 'paper' standard and not a 'construction' standard. Therefore, the planners responsibility ends with the creation of a compliant CAP. This means that the Implementation Plan should be for one planning cycle plus some dead band for calendar year timing issues. Twenty-four months for the implementation of all requirements was proposed.

Bernie will update the Implementation Plan with the latest changes from the roadmap document for the next meeting.

**Action Item** — Bernie will update the implementation Plan for the Charlotte meeting.

## **8. Review Comments on Measures**

This item was not discussed due to time constraints.

## **9. Next Steps — John Odom**

Sub-teams are tasked with finalizing the comment responses including the summary response for the next meeting. The summaries will be reviewed in Charlotte.

Q15 should be answered to the fullest extent possible but it may not be realistic to provide some comments until the responses for other questions are finalized.

**Action Item** — Sub-teams will provide comment responses including summaries prior to the Charlotte meeting.

## **10. Next Meetings**

- a. Face-to-face-meeting in Charlotte, NC on Wednesday, December 10, 2008 from 8 a.m.–5 p.m. EST and Thursday, December 11, 2008 from 8 a.m.–noon EST. Fall back location is Atlanta. GA. Details have been sent.

## **11. Action Items and Schedule — Ed Dobrowolski**

The following action items were developed during the meeting:

- Doug will present a cleaned up version of the tables to the SDT in Charlotte.
- Bernie will update the Implementation Plan for the Charlotte meeting.
- Sub-teams will provide comment responses including summaries prior to the Charlotte meeting.

The next posting is scheduled for mid-December.

## **12. Adjourn**

The Vice Chair thanked Ameren for their hospitality and adjourned the meeting at 2:30 p.m. CST on Wednesday, November 19, 2008.